

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ROBERT EDWARD LEE,

Plaintiff,

No. 14-11722

v.

District Judge Matthew F. Leitman
Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen

SAI LI, ET AL.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff Robert Lee, proceeding *pro se*, has filed a self-styled “Motion to Extend Time for Answer to Order or This Amend Motion” [Doc. #29]. It is not at all clear what Mr. Lee is requesting. Discovery has been stayed pending resolution of timely filed motions under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(c), and those motions are not due until July 16, 2015.

To the extent, then, that Mr. Lee is requesting reconsideration of the Court’s June 16, 2015 order denying without prejudice his request for discovery [Doc. #27], his motion would be denied.

The time for filing a response to a dispositive motion, such as a motion under Rule 12(c), is 21 days. If Mr. Lee is asking for additional time to respond to Defendant’s anticipated Rule 12(c) motion—and I believe this is the fairest reading of his motion— I will grant that request, in deference to the fact that he is not represented by counsel.

Accordingly, Mr. Lee’s motion [Doc. #29] is construed as a request for additional time to respond to Defendant’s anticipated Rule 12(c) motion, and is GRANTED.

Mr. Lee must file a response to a timely filed defense motion for judgment on the pleadings no later than 42 days after he receives the Defendant’s motion. Because Mr. Lee

is not an e-filer, he will be presumed to have received a copy of the Defendant's motion five days after the Defendant mails it to him.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/R. Steven Whalen
R. STEVEN WHALEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Date: July 13, 2015

Certificate of Service

I certify that a copy of this order was served upon parties of record via electronic or postal mail.

/s/A. Chubb
DEPUTY CLERK